

REMARKS

Introduction:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 19-21 have been amended and claims 1-18, 22, 23 and 36-44 are withdrawn. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 19-21 and 24-35 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings:

On page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected. However, since claim 21 has been amended and the subject matter in question removed from the claim, it is believed that the objection is traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 19, 20 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miller (US Patent Appl. No. 2004/0113875) in view of Kimura (US Patent No. 6,475,845). These rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 19, it is noted that, as amended, claim 19 recites a four-color converting part to perform gamma conversion with respect to primary RGB gray-scale data by multiplying each component of the RGB gray-scale data by a value of an inverse of a corresponding maximum gray-scale level, to extract a white color component from the gamma-converted RGB data, to generate four-color RGBW data by subtracting the white color component from the gamma-converted RGB data and by adding white gray-scale data to the gamma-converted RGB data, and to perform reverse gamma conversion to the RGBW data to generate compensated RGBW gray-scale data.

Thus, it may be seen that claim 19 incorporates certain subject matter of claim 20 as well as the recitation of “multiplying each component of the RGB gray-scale data by a value of an inverse of a corresponding maximum gray-scale level,” which has not been previously claimed but which finds support in the specification on page 15, lines 10-20.

In view of these amendments, applicant submits that neither cited reference to Miller or Kimura teaches or suggests the multiplying of each of the components of the RGB gray-scale

data by a value of a corresponding maximum gray-scale level. In fact, only the reference to Miller has been alleged as providing the base limitation of performing gamma conversion. Moreover, a review of Miller reveals that, while Miller discloses a white replacement algorithm, Miller does not specify how the peak red luminance, the peak green luminance and the peak blue luminance are each renormalized. Rather, Miller merely states that they are “renormalized from the white point of the display to the peak luminance of the white OLED 90, and the common luminance, i.e., the minimum of the three is calculated 92.

Thus, since Miller does not disclose the claimed “multiplying each component of the RGB gray-scale data by a value of an inverse of a corresponding maximum gray-scale level,” as claimed, and since the reference to Kimura fails to cure the defects of Miller, applicant respectfully asserts that claim 19 is patentable distinguished from any combination of Miller and Kimura and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 19 is overcome.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully notes that that the statement in the Office Action that Miller discloses an organic electro-luminescent display (OELD) is incorrect and that Miller is actually directed towards an organic light emitting diode (OLED). For example, Miller discloses “means for driving the OLEDs in the pixels to produce a given color and luminance at a reduced power usage,” in at least claim 1 of the reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Miller does not appear to teach or suggest the specifically claimed data driving part, scan driving part or OELD panel. As such, there exists no motivation for the combination of Miller and Kimura since such a combination would be redundant.

Regarding the rejections of claims 20 and 24-27, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 19 and that, therefore, the rejections of claims 20 and 24-27 are overcome for at least the reasons as set forth above.

In addition, claim 21 was rejected over Miller in view of Kimura and further in view of Hirano (WO 01/37249) and claims 28-35 were rejected over Miller in view of Kimura and further in view of Eida (US patent application no. 2001/0050532). However, applicant assert that, since the additional references to Hirano and Eida do not cure the defects of the Miller and Kimura references, and since claims 21 and 28-35 depend from claim 19, the rejections of these claims are overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion:

In accordance with the foregoing, applicant notes that the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. The Office is invited to contact applicant's attorneys at the below-listed telephone number concerning this Amendment or otherwise regarding the instant application. If there are any charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account no. 06-1130 maintained by applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Amy Bizon-Copp/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Registration No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: February 21, 2008